

Serial No. 10/024,118

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In Re Application of : July 19, 2007  
T. F. Boehme, et al : Group Art No.: 2142  
Serial No. 10/024,118 : Examiner: M.D.Meucci  
Filed: December 19, 2001 : for IBM Corporation  
Anne Vachon Dougherty  
Title: DISTRIBUTING INFORMATION 3173 Cedar Road  
IN A MARKUP LANGUAGE Yorktown Hts, NY 10598  
WITHIN A COMPUTER SYSTEM

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF (37 CFR 41.37)**

Appellants hereby appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences from the decision dated November 6, 2006 of the Examiner finally rejecting Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 13-18 in the above-identified patent application, and respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences consider the arguments presented herein and reverse the Examiner's rejection.

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

**I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The appeal is made on behalf of Assignee, International Business Machines Corporation, the real party in interest with respect to the subject patent application.

**II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no pending related appeals or interferences with respect to the subject patent application.

**III. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

There are fourteen (14) claims pending in the subject patent application, numbered 1-2, 5-10 and 13-18. No claims stand allowed. A complete copy of the claims involved in the appeal is attached hereto.

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

#### **IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

There are no unentered amendments filed after final rejection for the application.

#### **V. SUMMARY OF INVENTION**

A computer-based method and program storage device is claimed for providing information between multiple content provider nodes and a user node, with a portal node therebetween. The method comprises a portal node receiving information from multiple content provider nodes, the information having been generated in a markup language using different specific portlets at each of the content provider nodes; combining the received information using a generic portlet; and sending the combined information to the user.

#### **Independent Claim 1**

The computer-based method of providing information between a plurality of nodes coupled to a communication network wherein the plurality of nodes (Fig. 1) comprises more than one content provider nodes (11-13 of Fig. 1, page

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

4, lines 23-26), at least one user node (19 of Fig. 1), and a portal node (17 of Fig. 1) between said content providers and said at least one user node, as recited in Claim 1, comprises the steps of receiving, at a portal node, user-requested content information from more than one content provider nodes (page 4, line 33-page 5, line 3), wherein the user-requested content information has been generated in a markup language using multiple different portlets (page 6, lines 3-4) comprising a specific portlet (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, lines 29033 and page 6, lines 1-8) at each of the more than one content provider nodes; combining, at the portal node (page 5, lines 4-8), the received user-requested content information using a generic portlet (page 3, lines 23-24 and page 4, lines 1-3) to produce combined user-requested content information (page 5, lines 6-8); and sending, from the portal node, (page 5, lines 9-11) the combined user-requested content information to a user node.

**Independent Claim 9**

Independent Claim 9 recites a computer-based method of providing information between a plurality of nodes coupled to a communication network wherein the plurality of nodes (Fig. 1) comprises more than one content provider nodes

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

(page 4, lines 23-26 and 11-13 of Fig. 1), at least one user node (19 of Fig. 1), and a portal node (17 of Fig. 1) between the content provider nodes and the user nodes, comprising the steps of generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, line 27-page 5, line 2 and page 6, lines 1-8); sending, from the at least one content provider node, the generated user-requested content information to a portal node (page 4, line 33-page 5, line 2) for combining (page 5, lines 3-8) with information in the markup language received from other content provider nodes using different specific portlets (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, lines 29-33 and page 6, lines 1-8) to produce combined user-requested content information and sending the combined user-requested content information to a user node using a generic portlet (page 3, lines 23-24, page 4, lines 1-3 and page 5, lines 9-11).

**Independent Claim 17**

Claim 17 recites a computer program product for use in a content delivery network (Fig. 1) comprising a plurality of nodes, the product comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs (page 3, lines 6-9) which

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

when executed implement the steps of receiving, at a portal node, user-requested content information from more than one content provider nodes (page 4, line 33-page 5, line 3), wherein the user-requested content information has been generated in a markup language using multiple different portlets (page 6, lines 3-4) comprising a specific portlet (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, lines 29033 and page 6, lines 1-8) at each of the more than one content provider nodes; combining, at the portal node (page 5, lines 4-8), the received user-requested content information using a generic portlet (page 3, lines 23-24 and page 4, lines 1-3) to produce combined user-requested content information (page 5, lines 6-8); and sending, from the portal node, (page 5, lines 9-11) the combined user-requested content information to a user node.

**Independent Claim 18**

Independent Claim 18 recites a computer program product (page 3, lines 6-9) for use in a content delivery network (Fig. 1) comprising a plurality of nodes (user node 19, portal node 17 and content provider nodes 11-13 of Fig. 1), the product comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

of generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, line 27-page 5, line 2 and page 6, lines 1-8); sending, from the at least one content provider node, the generated user-requested content information to a portal node (page 4, line 33-page 5, line 2) for combining (page 5, lines 3-8) with information in the markup language received from other content provider nodes using different specific portlets (page 3, lines 22-23, page 4, lines 29-33 and page 6, lines 1-8) to produce combined user-requested content information and sending the combined user-requested content information to a user node using a generic portlet (page 3, lines 23-24, page 4, lines 1-3 and page 5, lines 9-11).

## **VI. GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED**

The grounds of rejection in the Final Office Action included the following:

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

-Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-10, 13-14 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,460,038 of Khan, et al (hereinafter "Kahn");

-Claims 1-2, 5, 9-10, 13 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as anticipated by Dumbill ("XML at Jetspeed") (hereinafter "Dumbill");

-Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahn in view of U.S. Patent 6,754,833 of Black (hereinafter "Black");

-Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahn in view of Black and further in view of "Official Notice";

-Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan in view of Black; and

-Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan in view of Black and Official Notice.

**VII. ARGUMENT**

**Anticipation rejections**

**Claims 1 and 17**



**Serial No. 10/024,118**

A computer-based method and program storage device is claimed for providing information between multiple content provider nodes and a user node, with a portal node inbetween. The method comprises a portal node receiving information from multiple content provider nodes, the information having been generated in a markup language using different specific portlets at each of the content provider nodes; the portal node combining the received information using a generic portlet; and the portal node sending the combined information to the user.

The term "**portlet**" is described in the Specification on page 3 as a "content-specific application that runs on a portal". A **portlet** is not a portal, but is the application which runs on a portal. Appellants respectfully contend that the Examiner has erred in using the terms "**portal**" and "**portlet**" interchangeably in the prosecution of the application.

The Khan patent teaches a bookmarking system and method for a user to choose to bookmark remote computer locations (e.g., a content provider sites) and for a bookmark server to store information (i.e., URLs) for linking the user to the sites. A customizable bookmark

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

portal page is created for the user at the server. The portal page is not a portlet. The portal page is a page with a list of bookmarks (i.e., hyperlinks) which can be customized by the user and selected by the user for access to the web sites. When a user wants to access a bookmarked site, the user contacts the server, accesses the bookmark portal page, and selects one of the user's bookmark entries. The server can also provide the service of scanning the sites listed on the user's bookmark portal page for updates, and push updated content to the user. The Examiner has concluded that Khan anticipates the claim language since Khan provides a portal page with a list of URLs on a user's bookmark portal page. Khan teaches combining a list of URLs on a portal page. Khan does not teach a **generic portlet** for combining **content** generated by multiple different portlets. Khan doesn't provide a generic **portlet**, rather, Khan provides a **portal** page. Khan doesn't combine content generated by specific portlets at multiple sites, it lists URLs (Col. 1, lines 49-52). The cited passage at Col. 1, lines 44-52 does not teach combining content, it teaches offering access. The

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

teachings from Col. 1, lines 34-37 do not teach sending combined content, but teach that each portal has customized content. The cited passage from Col. 12, line 66 through Col. 13, line 22 teaches that each bookmarked site delivers content to the user, which does not anticipate a portal node delivering combined content to a user.

The Examiner cites Khan's teaching that the system uses HTML **OR** another protocol (Col. 6, lines 1-6), which is not the same as a generic portlet for combining content generated by different specific portlets. Further, under Khan when a user accesses a content provider node to request content, the content is delivered directly to the user from the accessed site, not from the bookmark server (Col. 1, lines 34-37 and Col. 12, line 66-Col. 13, line 22). Khan does teach that the bookmark server can push updates; but, in so doing, Khan's server makes "arrangements with web sites to push regular site updates...to users and will relay these updates" (Col. 11, lines 39-47). Khan's server is not using a generic portlet; is not translating or reformatting content, but is merely relaying content; is

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

not combining content from different sites generated with different specific portlets; and is not sending combined content to a user.

Anticipation under 35 USC 102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of a claimed invention. See: In re Schreiber, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Paulsen, 30 F. 3d 1475, 1478-1479, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1673 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Spada, 911 F. 2d 705, 708, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1657 (Fed. Cir. 1990) and RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data Sys., Inc., 730 F. 2d 1440, 1444, 221 USPQ 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Clearly, Khan does not anticipate independent Claims 1 and 17, or the claims that depend therefrom since Khan's **portal** is not a **portlet** and since Khan does not teach the receiving of content generated using different specific portlets, the combining of content at a portal node using a generic portlet, and the sending of combined information from the portal node to the user.

**Claim 2**

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

Claim 2 recites that the content information comprises fragments of information and that the portal node combines the fragments into a combined user-requested content information. The cited Khan passages do not teach or suggest combining fragments. The passage from Col. 1 teaches that a user may want information from multiple sources, but does not make any mention of fragments or of combining fragments. The passage from Cols. 12-13 teaches that a user may program bookmarks to deliver content directly from the bookmarked provider to the user. Again, Khan makes no mention of fragments or of combining fragments of requested information using a generic portlet.

**Claim 5**

Claim 5 recites wherein the combined user-requested information is configured for display on a browser at the user node. What Khan teaches in the cited passage from Col. 13 is that a user may program a bookmark to deliver content to the user in a browser-based custom portal or via e-mail. As argued above, Khan does not teach combining information at all, let alone configuring combined information for display on a browser. Delivery

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

of content directly from a provider to a user does not anticipate the invention as claimed.

**Claim 6**

Claim 6 recites wherein the markup language is HTML. The Khan patent does teach at Col. 6, lines 1-6 that HTML may be used. However, Khan does not teach HTML in the context of the receiving, combining and sending of independent Claim 1 from which Claim 6 depends.

**Claim 9 and 18**

With respect to the language of Claims 9 and 18, Khan does not teach the steps or computer program product for execution of steps of generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet; sending the generated information to a portal node for combining with information in the markup language received from other content provider nodes using a generic portlet and

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

for sending the combined information to a user node. Khan merely combines URLs in a list on a portal page and, when pushing content, relays content from a single site without alteration or combining the content. Khan's combining of URLs into a list on a portal page is not the same as or suggestive of combining content with a generic portlet. Appellants reiterate that the Examiner has erred in interpreting the Khan **portal page** as synonymous with a **portlet**, and has erred in concluding that Khan anticipates the claims. The cited passage from Col. 1, lines 34-52 teaches that a user may want to access selected news content from different sources. There is nothing in the cited passage which teaches or suggests sending generated user-requested content, which has been generated with a specific portlet, to a portal node for combining with other information generated with a different specific portlet by the portal node using a generic portlet. Similarly, the cited passage from Col. 12, line 66-Col. 13, line 8 does not teach the invention as claimed. The cited passage states that a user may program a bookmark to directly deliver the desired content to the user, which is not the same as or

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

suggestive of sending content to a portal node for combining with other content. Anticipation under 35 USC 102 is established only when a single prior art reference discloses each and every element of a claimed invention. See: In re Schreiber, 128 F. 3d 1473, 1477, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Since Khan does not teach every claim feature, the anticipation rejection of Claims 9 and 18 cannot be sustained.

**Claim 10**

Claim 10 recites that the content information comprises fragments of information and that the portal node combines the fragments into a combined user-requested content information. The cited Khan passage does not teach or suggest combining fragments. The passage from Col. 1 teaches that a user may want information from multiple sources, but does not make any mention of fragments or of combining fragments. The passage from Cols. 12-13 teaches that a user may program bookmarks to deliver content directly from the bookmarked provider to the user. Again, Khan makes no mention of fragments or of combining fragments of requested information using a generic portlet.



**Claim 13**

Claim 13 recites wherein the combined user-requested information is configured for display on a browser at the user node. What Khan teaches in the cited passage from Col. 13 is that a user may program a bookmark to deliver content to the user in a browser-based custom portal or via e-mail. The Khan teachings from Col. 14, line 56 through Col. 15, line 16 and Fig. 10 detail programmable bookmarks, but do not teach or suggest the invention as claimed. As argued above, Khan does not teach combining information at all, let alone configuring combined information for display on a browser. Delivery of content directly from a provider to a user does not anticipate the invention as claimed.

**Claim 14**

Claim 14 recites wherein the markup language is HTML. The Khan patent does teach at Col. 6, lines 1-6 that HTML may be used. However, Khan does not teach HTML in the context of the generating with a specific portlet

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

and sending for combining as recited in independent Claim 9 from which Claim 14 depends.

**Claims 1 and 17**

The independent Claims 1 and 17 have additionally been rejected as anticipated by the Dumbill reference. The Dumbill reference is the author's analysis of Jetspeed, a product for providing a gateway to multiple information resources. Dumbill provides a different definition of the term "portlet" than does the present application. The term "**portlet**", as per page 3 of the present Specification, is a "content-specific application that runs on a portal". Dumbill states that "boxes of headlines on the front page are, in fact, the representations of so-called *portlets*--information chunks imported into Jetspeed" (page 2, lines 1-3). Dumbill further teaches that "Jetspeed automatically builds a database of networked resources into portlets" (page 2, lines 3-4); that Jetspeed "defines a portlet API" (page 2, line 6); that a "user is the able (*sic*) to arrange the available portlets on their home page" (page 3, line 41); and that "[I]f you want to go further than providing a

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

headline feed for your information into the portal, then you need to write your own code for a portlet" (page 5, lines 3-4). Essentially, Dumbill teaches that Jetspeed provides a gateway with a list of portlets (a.k.a., information chunks).

Dumbill does not teach or suggest a portal node receiving content generated by multiple different specific portlets (i.e., content-specific applications) on different content provider nodes, combining content using a generic portlet, and sending combined content to a user. Dumbill suggests a gateway providing a list of portlets (page 4, line 31). Listing portlets does not anticipate a generic portlet for combining content generated by different specific portlets. Further, Dumbill states that if a user wants more than a list/headline feed, the user must write their own code for a portlet (page 5, lines 3-4). Clearly Dumbill is not teaching the invention as claimed.

For a patent to anticipate another invention under 35 USC § 102, the patent must clearly teach each and every claimed feature. Dumbill teaches a gateway or **portal** for listing portlets, and refers to portlets as

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

"information chunks". Dumbill does not teach a portal node between content provider nodes and user nodes for using a generic portlet to combine received information generated by different specific portlets at multiple content providers and for sending the combined information to a user node. Accordingly, it cannot be maintained that Dumbill anticipates each and every claim feature of Claims 1 and 17.

**Claim 2**

Dumbill does not teach using a generic portlet to combine fragments of user-requested information, each generated using specific portlets. The cited Dumbill paragraph from page 2 states that Jetspeed uses caching to build a database of networked resources. There is nothing in the cited passage that teaches or suggests combining fragments of user-requested information, each generated using specific portlets. The cited passage from paragraphs 2 and 3 of page 4 of Dumbill states that Jetspeed can provide a list of portlets. Again, there is nothing in the cited passage which teaches or suggests

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

the claim language of combining fragments in the method comprising the receiving, combining and sending of Claim 1.

**Claim 5**

Dumbill does teach that Jetspeed allows a user to view its displayed contents via the user's browser. However, the Dumbill teachings do not include the receiving, combining and sending as set forth in Claim 1 from which Claim 5 depends.

**Claims 9 and 18**

With respect to the language of Claims 9 and 18, Dumbill does not teach the steps or computer program product for execution of steps of generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet; sending the generated information to a portal node for combining with information in the markup language received from other content provider nodes using a generic portlet and for sending the combined

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

information to a user node. The Examiner cites paragraph 4 from page 1 of Dumbill against the claim step of generating content using a specific portlet. The cited paragraph merely states that Jetspeed is designed to be a gateway to information sources/resrouces and that XML is used as the mediating format for incoming data. There is no teaching of generating user-requested content information in a markup language using a specfic portlet. Further the Dumbill article does not teach or suggest the sending of generated user-requested content for combining with other specific-portlet-generated content using a generic portlet. Rather, the cited passage from page 2, as discussed above, states that headlines are representations of information chunks called portlets, and the cited passage from page 4 states that Jetspeed can list portlets. Neither passage teaches or suggests sending generated user-requested content for combining with other specific-portlet-generated content using a generic portlet. Clearly, Dumbill does not anticipate the invention as claimed.

**Claim 10**

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

Claim 10, which recited the generating of fragments of information, has been rejected using the same Dumbill teachings as were cited against the language of Claim 9 from which Claim 10 depends. Appellants reiterate that Dumbill is not teaching or suggesting the generating of content information or fragments of information using a specific portlet or the sending of that generated information fragment for combination with other generated information fragments using a generic portlet.

**Claim 13**

Claim 13, which recites configuring combined content information for display on a browser, is not anticipated by the cited Dumbill teachings and Fig. 1 which show that Dumbill provides display via a browser. Appellants maintain that Dumbill does not teach the generating and sending of Claim 9, from which Claim 13 depends.

**Obviousness rejections****Claim 7**

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

Claim 7 recites where the user-requested content information is associated with a fee. The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 as unpatentable over Khan in view of Black. The cited Black patent does teach that content retrieved from sources may require fee payment.

Appellants maintain, however, that the addition of Black's fees to the Khan system would not render the claim obvious since neither Black nor Khan teach the receiving of content generated using specific portlets, the combining of received content using a generic portlet, and the sending of combined content as is set forth in Claim 1 from which Claim 7 depends. For a determination of obviousness, the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art" (*In re Wilson*, 424 F. 2d 1382, 1385, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). If the cited references fail to teach each and every one of the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner.

**Claim 8**



**Serial No. 10/024,118**

Claim 8 depends from Claim 7 and additionally recited accepting a fee before the receiving step. The Examiner again cites Khan and Black and takes Official Notice that receiving a fee may precede delivery of content. Appellants again argue, however, that none of the cited references or material of which the Examiner takes Official Notice teaches the receiving of content generated using specific portlets, the combining of received content using a generic portlet, and the sending of combined content as is set forth in Claim 1 from which Claim 8 indirectly depends. The Federal Circuit has stated that when patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the obviousness determination "must be based on objective evidence of record" and that "this precedent has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with." (In re Lee, 277 F. 3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Moreover, the Federal Circuit has stated that "conclusory statements" by an examiner fail to adequately address the factual question of motivation, which is material to patentability and cannot be resolved "on subjective belief and unknown authority" (Id. at 1343-1344).

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

Appellants assert that the Examiner has merely provided conclusory statements without citing objective evidence of the teachings or of motivation to combine the teachings.

**Claim 15**

Claim 15 further recites where the user-requested content information is associated with a fee. The Examiner has rejected Claim 15 as unpatentable over Khan in view of Black. The cited Black patent does teach that content retrieved from sources may require fee payment. Appellants maintain, however, that the addition of Black's fees to the Khan system would not render the claim obvious since neither Black nor Khan teach the generating of user-requested content using specific portlets, or the sending of the generated content for combining with other generated content using a generic portlet, as is set forth in Claim 9 from which Claim 15 depends. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established when the teachings of the prior art itself suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781,

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

783, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A proper *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art absent some teaching, incentive, or suggestion supporting the combination. *In re Napier*, 55 F.3d 610, 613, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1782, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Appellants believe that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

**Claim 16**

Claim 16 depends from Claim 15 and additionally recites accepting a fee before the sending step. The Examiner again cites Khan and Black and takes Official Notice that receiving a fee may precede sending content. Appellants again argue, however, that none of the cited references or Official Notice teaches the generating of content using specific portlets, or the sending of generated content for combination with other generated content using a generic portlet as is set forth in Claim 9 from which Claim 16 indirectly depends. The Federal Circuit has stated that when patentability turns on the

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

question of obviousness, the obviousness determination "must be based on objective evidence of record" and that "this precedent has been reinforced in myriad decisions, and cannot be dispensed with." (In re Lee, 277 F. 3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Moreover, the Federal Circuit has stated that "conclusory statements" by an examiner fail to adequately address the factual question of motivation, which is material to patentability and cannot be resolved "on subjective belief and unknown authority" (Id. at 1343-1344). Appellants maintain that the Examiner is providing conclusory statements without support in the art.

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

**CONCLUSION**

Appellants respectfully assert that the Examiner has erred in interpreting the teachings of the prior art and has erred in rejecting Claims 1-2, 5-10 and 15-18. Appellants request that the decisions of the Examiner be overturned by the Board and that the claims be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,  
T. F. Boehme, et al

By: /Anne Vachon Dougherty/  
Anne Vachon Dougherty  
Registration No. 30,374  
Tel. (914) 962-5910

APPENDIX OF CLAIMS

1. A computer-based method of providing information between a plurality of nodes coupled to a communication network wherein the plurality of nodes comprises more than one content provider nodes, at least one user node, and a portal node between said content providers and said at least one user node, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving, at a portal node, user-requested content information from more than one content provider nodes, wherein the user-requested content information has been generated in a markup language using multiple different portlets comprising a specific portlet at each of the more than one content provider nodes;

combining, at the portal node, the received user-requested content information using a generic portlet to produce combined user-requested content information; and

sending, from the portal node, the combined user-requested content information to a user node.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the content information comprises fragments of information generated in the markup language at the more than one content provider nodes, and

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

wherein the combining step comprises combining the fragments of information into the combined user-requested content information.

3. (canceled)

4. (canceled)

5. The method of claim 1, wherein the combined user-requested content information is configured for displaying on a browser at the user node.

6. The method of claim 1, wherein the markup language is the Hypertext Markup Language (HTML).

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the user-requested content information received from the at least one of the more than one content provider nodes is associated with a fee.

8. The method of claim 7, further comprising the step of accepting a fee before the receiving step.

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

9. A computer-based method of providing information between a plurality of nodes coupled to a communication network wherein the plurality of nodes comprises more than one content provider nodes at least one user node, and a portal node between the content provider nodes and the user nodes, the method comprising the steps of:

generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet;

sending, from the at least one content provider node, the generated user-requested content information to a portal node for combining with information in the markup language received from other content provider nodes using different specific portlets to produce combined user-requested content information and sending the combined user-requested content information to a user node using a generic portlet.

10. The method of claim 9, wherein the generating step comprises generating fragments of information in the markup language, and wherein the sending step comprises sending the fragments of information to a portal node for combining and sending to a user node.



**Serial No. 10/024,118**

11. (canceled)

12. (canceled)

13. The method of claim 9, wherein the user-requested content information sent to the user node is configured for displaying on a browser at the user node.

14. The method of claim 9, wherein the markup language is the Hypertext Markup Language (HTML).

15. The method of claim 9, further comprising the step of associating the generated user-requested content information with a fee.

16. The method of claim 15, further comprising the step of charging a fee before the sending step.

17. A computer program product for use in a content delivery network comprising a plurality of nodes, the product comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

receiving, at a portal node, user-requested content information from more than one content provider nodes comprising multiple different portlets, each content provider node having a specific portlet, wherein the user-requested content information has been generated in a markup language using a specific portlet at each of the more than one content provider nodes;

combining, at the portal node, the received user-requested content information using a generic portlet to produce combined user-requested content information; and

sending, from the portal node, the combined user-requested content information to a user node.

18. A computer program product for use in a content delivery network comprising a plurality of nodes, the product comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:

generating, within at least one content provider node, user-requested content information in a markup language using a specific portlet;

sending, from the at least one content provider node, the generated information to a portal node for combining with information in the markup language received from other

**Serial No. 10/024,118**

content provider nodes to produce combined user-requested content information and sending the combined user-requested content information to a user node using a generic portlet.

Serial No. 10/024,118

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

There is no additional evidence for this matter.

Serial No. 10/024,118

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

There are no related proceedings.